



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/874,802	06/05/2001	Brian T. Webb	9204-10	5921

7590 06/21/2005  
WAGNER, MURABITO & HOA LLP  
Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

BAUM, RONALD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2136

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/874,802

Applicant(s)

WEBB ET AL

Examiner

Ronald Baum

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-7,9-12,14-16,18-21,23-26,28-30,32-35,37-40 and 42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-7,9-12,14-16,18-21,23-26,28-30,32-35,37-40,42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                        |                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                                       | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in reply to applicant's correspondence of 31 March 2005.
2. Claims 1,2,4-7,9-12,14-16,18-21,23-26,28-30,32-35,37-40,42 are pending for examination.
3. Claims 1,2,4-7,9-12,14-16,18-21,23-26,28-30,32-35,37-40,42 remain rejected.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1,2,4-7,9-12,14-16,18-21,23-26,28-30,32-35,37-40,42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Raanan et al, U.S. Patent 6,311,278 B1.

5. As per claim 1; "A method of accessing devices on a private network via a client on a public network, the method comprising the following steps performed by a gateway on the private network [ABSTRACT, figure 1-2 and accompanying descriptions]:

accepting

a user log-in request from

the client prior to ascertaining rights of the user,

wherein the user log-in request includes

an identification of the user, and

wherein the user log-in request has

a predetermined life span [i.e., col. 2, lines 39-col. 3, line 23, co. 3, lines 53-col. 5, lines 28, whereas ‘... the identifying of the client/server/particular application and/or the particular *session* ...’ such that session aspects (i.e., the specifications thereof and associated setup/timeout, etc.), clearly encompasses the ‘...user log-in request ... ascertaining rights of the user ... user log-in request has a predetermined life span ...’ elements of the claim language, insofar as the session components of the ‘...protocol extraction ...’ aspects relate to timing (i.e., predetermined) aspects of authorization and authentication, as broadly interpreted by the examiner.];

ascertaining

rights of a user to

access one or more devices on the private network;

receiving

a request from the client to

access a Web server of a device on the private network,

wherein the web server has an address that

is valid on the private network but

is not valid on the public network [col. 1, lines 30-col. 10, line 18,

whereas the use of a firewall/gateway network interface node clearly

encompasses the aspect of the address translation between the 2 networks

for the low level (i.e., physical layer NIC signature) addressing, such that

Art Unit: 2136

the address spaces would be unique between the client (NIC) on the public network and the server (NIC) on the private network.];

redirecting

the received client request to

the Web server of the device on the private network [i.e., col. 2, lines 49-59, col.

3, lines 65-col. 5, line 9, col. 5, lines 29-60];

scrubbing

a Web page served by the Web server in response to

the received client request, comprising

replacing

an address in the Web page that is not valid on the public network

with

an address that is valid on the public network [i.e., col. 2, lines 49-

59, col. 3, lines 65-col. 5, line 9, col. 6, lines 1-28, col. 7, lines 45-col. 8, line

7]; and

serving

the scrubbed Web page to

the client [i.e., col. 2, lines 49-59, col. 3, lines 65-col. 5, line 9]. ”.

Further, as per claim 15; “A gateway system [This claim is the system mean plus function claim for the method claim 1 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 1 rejection] that permits access to devices on a private network via a client on a public network,

Art Unit: 2136

comprising: means for accepting a user log-in request from the client prior to ascertaining rights of the user, wherein the user log-in request includes an identification of the user, and wherein the user log-in request has a predetermined life span; means for receiving a request from the client to access a Web server of a device on the private network, wherein the Web server has an address that is valid on the private network but is not valid on the public network; means for redirecting the received client request to the Web server; means for scrubbing a Web page served by the Web server in response to the received client request, comprising means for replacing an address in the Web page that is not valid on the public network with an address that is valid on the public network; and means for serving the scrubbed Web page to the client.”

Further, as per claim 29; “A computer program product [This claim is the embodied software claim for the method claim 1 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 1 rejection] that permits access to devices on a private network via a client on a public network, the computer program product comprising a computer usable storage medium having computer readable program code embodied in the medium, the computer readable program code comprising: computer readable program code that accepts a user log-in request from the client, wherein the user log-in request comprises an identification of the user, and wherein the user log-in request has a predetermined life span; computer readable program code that receives a request from the client to access a Web server of a device on the private network, wherein the Web server has an address that is valid on the private network but is not valid on the public network; computer readable program code that redirects the received client request to the Web server; computer readable program code that scrubs a Web page served by the Web server in response to

Art Unit: 2136

the received client request, comprising computer readable Program code that replaces an address in the Web page that is not valid on the public network with an address that is valid on the public network; and computer readable program code that serves the scrubbed Web page to the client.”.

6. Claim 2 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method according to Claim 1, further comprising the following steps performed by the gateway after ascertaining rights of a user to access one or more devices and prior to receiving a request from the client to access a Web server of the device:

serving a Web page to the client that identifies each device on the private network for which the user has access rights,

wherein the Web page includes to a link to a Web server of each device on the private network for which the user has access rights.”.

The teachings of Raanan et al suggest such limitations (col. 1, lines 30-col. 10, line 18, whereas the use of a firewall/gateway to determine authorized and allowable actions by the client (i.e., col. 2, lines 39-col. 3, line 23, col. 4, lines 65-col. 5, line 29, 61-67, col. 7, lines 19-25), are broadly interpreted to encompass the “ascertaining rights of a user to access one or more devices on the private network” limitation, and the extraction/robot module translation of addressing (i.e., URL, IP level addressing) protocol information (i.e., col. 3, lines 53-col. 4, line 33, col. 5, lines 60-col. 6, line 59, col. 7, lines 5-8, col. 8, lines 64-col. 9, line 18) are broadly interpreted to encompass the “...includes to a link to a Web server of each device on the private network for which the user has access rights” limitation.).

Further, claim 16 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The gateway system [This claim is the system mean plus function claim for the method claim 2 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 2 rejection] according to Claim 15, further comprising: means for ascertaining rights of a user to access one or more devices on the private network; and 5 means for serving a Web page to the client that identifies each device on the private network for which the user has access rights, wherein the Web page includes a link to a Web server of each device on the private network for which the user has access rights.”.

Further, claim 30 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The computer program product [This claim is the embodied software claim for the method claim 2 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 2 rejection] according to claim 29, further comprising: computer readable program code that ascertains rights of a user to access one or more devices on the private network; and computer readable program code that serves a Web page to the client that identifies each device on the private network for which the user has access rights, wherein the Web page includes a link to a Web server of each device on the private network for which the user has access rights.”.

7. Claim 4 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method according to Claim 2, wherein each link to a Web sever includes  
  
a uniform resource Locator (URL) for the gateway that is valid on the public network and  
  
an identification of a gateway port that is mapped to a respective Web server, and



wherein each link is configured to send a request to  
a respective Web server via  
the gateway at an identified gateway port.”.

The teachings of Raanan et al suggest such limitations (col. 1, lines 30-col. 10, line 18, whereas the use of an extraction/robot module translation of addressing (i.e., URL, IP level addressing) protocol information (i.e., col. 3, lines 53-col. 4, line 33, col. 5, lines 60-col. 6, line 59, col. 7, lines 5-8, col. 8, lines 64-col. 9, line 18) are broadly interpreted to encompass the “... (URL) for the gateway ... valid on the public network ... identification ... port ... mapped to a respective Web server, ... link is ... to send a request to a ... Web server via the gateway at an identified gateway port” limitation, whereas the use of the Internet Web protocol data structures clearly encompasses port addressing (i.e., that’s how applications are delineated from each other from an Internet network element perspective)).

Further, claim 18 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The gateway system [This claim is the system mean plus function claim for the method claim 4 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 4 rejection] according to Claim 16, wherein each link to a Web server includes a uniform resource locator (URL) for the gateway system that is valid on the public network and an identification of a gateway system port that is mapped to a respective Web server, and wherein each link is configured to send a request to a respective Web server via the gateway system at an identified gateway System port.”.

Further, claim 32 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The computer program product [This claim is the embodied software claim for the method claim 4 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 4 rejection] according to Claim 30, wherein each link to a Web server includes a uniform resource locator (URL) for a gateway on the private network that is valid on the public network and an identification of a gateway port that is mapped to a respective Web server, and wherein each link is configured to send a request to a respective Web server via the gateway at an identified gateway port.”.

8. Claim 5 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method according to Claim 1, wherein the scrubbing step comprises

replacing

an address in the Web page that is valid only on the private network with a URL for the gateway that is valid on the public network and

an identification of a gateway port that is mapped to the replaced address.”.

The teachings of Raanan et al suggest such limitations (col. 1, lines 30-col. 10, line 18, whereas the use of an extraction/robot module translation of addressing (i.e., URL, IP level addressing) protocol information (i.e., col. 3, lines 53-col. 4, line 33, col. 5, lines 60-col. 6, line 59, col. 7, lines 5-8, col. 8, lines 64-col. 9, line 18) are broadly interpreted to encompass the “replacing an address ... Web page ... valid ... with a URL for the gateway ... valid ... and an identification of a ... port that is mapped to the replaced address.” limitation, whereas the use of the Internet Web

protocol data structures clearly encompasses port addressing (i.e., that's how applications are delineated from each other from a Internet network element perspective).).

Further, claim 19 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The gateway system [This claim is the system mean plus function claim for the method claim 5 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 5 rejection] according to Claim 15, wherein the means for scrubbing a Web page comprises means for replacing an address in the Web page that is valid only on the private network with a URL for the gateway system that is valid on the public network and an identification of a gateway system port that is mapped to the replaced address.";

Further, claim 33 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The computer program product [This claim is the embodied software claim for the method claim 5 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 5 rejection] according to Claim 29, wherein the computer readable program code that scrubs a Web page comprises computer readable program code that replaces an address in the Web page that is valid only on the private network with a URL for a gateway on the private network that is valid on the public network and an identification of a gateway port that is mapped to the replaced address.".

9. Claim 6 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method according to Claim 2, wherein the step of serving a Web page to the client comprises:

scanning a range of private network addresses to identify Web servers listening on one or more selected ports;

mapping each identified Web server to a respective gateway port; and  
creating a Web page that contains a respective link to each gateway port for each  
device for which the to user has access rights.”.

The teachings of Raanan et al suggest such limitations (col. 1, lines 30-col. 10, line 18, whereas the use of a firewall/gateway to determine authorized and allowable actions by the client (i.e., col. 2, lines 39-col. 3, line 23, col. 4, lines 65-col. 5, line 29, 61-67, col. 7, lines 19-25), are broadly interpreted to encompass the “mapping ... to a respective gateway port; ... creating a Web page ... link to each gateway port ... device for which the to user has access rights” limitation, and the extraction/robot module translation of addressing (i.e., URL, IP level addressing) protocol information (i.e., col. 3, lines 53-col. 4, line 33, col. 5, lines 60-col. 6, line 59, col. 7, lines 5-8, col. 8, lines 64-col. 9, line 18) are broadly interpreted to encompass the “scanning a range of private network addresses to identify Web servers listening on one or more selected ports” limitation.).

Further, claim 20 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The gateway system [This claim is the system mean plus function claim for the method claim 6 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 6 rejection] according to Claim 16, wherein the means for serving a Web page to the client comprises: means for scanning a range of private network addresses to identify Web servers listening on one or more selected ports; means for mapping each identified Web server to a respective gateway system port; and means for creating a Web page that contains a to respective link to each gateway system port for each device for which the user has access rights.”.

Further, claim 34 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The computer program product [This claim is the embodied software claim for the method claim 6 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 6 rejection] according to Claim 30, wherein the computer readable program code that serves a Web page to the client comprises: computer readable program code that scans a range of private network addresses to identify Web servers listening on one or more selected ports; computer readable program code that maps each identified Web server to a respective port of a gateway on the private network; and to computer readable program code that creates a Web page that contains a respective link to each gateway port for each device for which the user has access rights.”.

10. As per claim 7; “A method of accessing devices on a private network via a client on a public network, wherein each device includes a Web server having an address that is valid on the private network, but is not valid on the public network, the method comprising the following steps performed by a gateway on the private network:

accepting a user log-in request from the client prior to ascertaining rights of the user, wherein the user log-in request includes an identification of the user, and wherein the user log-in request has a predetermined life span;

ascertaining rights of a user to access one or more devices on the private network;  
serving a Web page to the client that identifies each device on the private network for which the user has access rights, wherein the Web page includes a link to a Web server of each device on the private network for which the user has access rights;

Art Unit: 2136

receiving a request from the client to access a Web server of a device on the private network in response to user activation of a link on the Web page;

redirecting the received client request to the Web server; scrubbing a Web page served by the Web server in response to the received client request, comprising removing links to Web servers of devices for which the user does not have access rights; and

serving the scrubbed Web page to the client [This claim is the combination of claims 1,2 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claims 1,2 rejection].”.

Further, as per claim 21; “A gateway system [This claim is the system mean plus function claim for the method claim 7 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 7 rejection] that permits access to devices on a private network via a client on a public network, wherein each device includes a Web server having an address that is valid on the private network, but is not valid on the public network, wherein the gateway system comprises: means for accepting a user log-in request from the client prior to ascertaining rights of the user, wherein the user log-in request includes an identification of the user, and wherein the user log-in request has a predetermined life span; means for ascertaining rights of a user to access one or more devices on the private network; means for serving a Web page to the client that identifies each device or the private network for which the user has access rights, wherein the Web page includes a link to a Web server of: each device on the private network for which the user has access rights; means for receiving a request from the client to access a Web server of a device on the private network in response to user activation of a link on the Web page; means for redirecting the received client request to the Web server; means for scrubbing a Web page served

Art Unit: 2136

by the Web server in response to the received client request, comprising means for removing links to Web servers of devices for which the user does not have access rights; and means for serving the scrubbed Web page to the client”.

Further, as per claim 35; “A computer program product [This claim is the embodied software claim for the method claim 7 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 7 rejection] that permits access to devices on a private network via a client on a public network, wherein each device includes a Web server having an address that is valid on the private network, but is not valid on the public network, the computer program product comprising a computer usable storage medium having computer readable program code embodied in the medium, the computer readable program code comprising: computer readable program code that accepts a user log-in request from the client, wherein the user log-in request comprises an identification of the user, and wherein the user log-in request has a predetermined life span; computer readable program code that ascertains rights of a user to access one or more devices on the private network; computer readable program code that serves a Web page to the client that identifies each device on the private network for which the user has access rights, wherein the Web page includes a link to a Web server of each device on the private network for which the user has access rights; computer readable program code that receives a request from the client to access a Web server of a device on the private network in response to user activation of a link on the Web page; computer readable program code that redirects the received client request to the Web server; computer readable program code that scrubs a Web page served by the Web server in response to the received client request, comprising computer readable program

code that removes links to Web servers of devices for which the user does not have access rights; and computer readable program code that serves the scrubbed Web page to the client.”.

11. Claim 9 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method according to Claim 7, wherein the scrubbing step further comprises

replacing

an address in the Web page that is not valid on the public network with  
an address that is valid on the public network.”.

The teachings of Raanan et al suggest such limitations (col. 1, lines 30-col. 10, line 18, whereas the use of an extraction/robot module translation of addressing (i.e., URL, IP level addressing) protocol information (i.e., col. 3, lines 53-col. 4, line 33, col. 5, lines 60-col. 6, line 59, col. 7, lines 5-8, col. 8, lines 64-col. 9, line 18) are broadly interpreted to encompass the “replacing an address ... Web page ... valid ... with an address ... valid ...” limitation.).

Further, claim 23 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The gateway system [This claim is the system mean plus function claim for the method claim 9 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 9 rejection] according to Claim 21, wherein the means for scrubbing a Web page further comprises means for replacing an address in the Web page that is not valid on the public network with an address that is valid on the public network.”.

Further, claim 37 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The computer program product [This claim is the embodied software claim for the method claim 9 above, and is rejected for the



Art Unit: 2136

same reasons provided for the claim 9 rejection] according to claim 35, wherein the computer readable program code that scrubs a Web page further comprises computer readable program code that replaces an address in the Web page that is not valid on the public network with an address that is valid on the public network.”.

12. Claim 10 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method according to Claim 7, wherein each link to a Web server includes

a uniform resource locator (URL) for the gateway that is valid on the public network and

an identification of a gateway port that is mapped to a respective Web server, and wherein each link is configured to

send a request to

a respective Web server via

the gateway at an identified gateway port.”.

The teachings of Raanan et al suggest such limitations (col. 1, lines 30-col. 10, line 18, whereas the use of an extraction/robot module translation of addressing (i.e., URL, IP level addressing) protocol information (i.e., col. 3, lines 53-col. 4, line 33, col. 5, lines 60-col. 6, line 59, col. 7, lines 5-8, col. 8, lines 64-col. 9, line 18) are broadly interpreted to encompass the “... (URL) for the gateway ... valid on the public network ... identification ... port ... mapped to a respective Web server, ... link is ... to send a request to a ... Web server via the gateway at an identified gateway port” limitation, whereas the use of the Internet Web protocol data structures clearly

encompasses port addressing (i.e., that's how applications are delineated from each other from a Internet network element perspective).).

Further, claim 24 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The gateway system [This claim is the system mean plus function claim for the method claim 10 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 10 rejection] according to Claim 21, wherein each link to a Web server includes a uniform resource locator (URL) for the gateway system that is valid on the public network and an identification of a gateway system port that is mapped to a respective Web server, and wherein each link is configured to send a request to a respective Web server via the gateway system at an identified gateway system port."

Further, claim 38 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The computer program product [This claim is the embodied software claim for the method claim 10 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 10 rejection] according to Claim 35, wherein each link to a Web server includes a uniform resource locator (URL) for a gateway on the private network that is valid on to a public network and an identification of a gateway port that is mapped to a respective Web server, and wherein each link is configured to send a request to a respective Web server via the gateway at an identified gateway port."

13. Claim 11 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method according to Claim 7, wherein the step of serving a Web page to the client comprises:  
scanning

a range of private network addresses to  
identify Web servers listening on one or more selected ports;  
mapping  
each identified Web server to  
a respective gateway port; and  
creating  
a Web page that contains  
a respective link to  
each gateway port for  
each device for which the to user has access rights.”.

The teachings of Raanan et al suggest such limitations (col. 1, lines 30-col. 10, line 18, whereas the use of a firewall/gateway to determine authorized and allowable actions by the client (i.e., col. 2, lines 39-col. 3, line 23, col. 4, lines 65-col. 5, line 29, 61-67, col. 7, lines 19-25), are broadly interpreted to encompass the “mapping ... to a respective gateway port; ... creating a Web page ... link to each gateway port ... device for which the to user has access rights” limitation, and the extraction/robot module translation of addressing (i.e., URL, IP level addressing) protocol information (i.e., col. 3, lines 53-col. 4, line 33, col. 5, lines 60-col. 6, line 59, col. 7, lines 5-8, col. 8, lines 64-col. 9, line 18) are broadly interpreted to encompass the “scanning a range of private network addresses to identify Web servers listening on one or more selected ports” limitation.).

Further, claim 25 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The gateway system [This claim is the system mean plus function claim for the method claim 11 above, and is rejected for

Art Unit: 2136

the same reasons provided for the claim 11 rejection] according to Claim 21, wherein the means for serving a Web page to the client comprises: means for scanning a range of private network addresses to identify Web servers listening on one or more selected ports; means for mapping each identified Web server to a respective gateway system port; and means for creating a Web page that contains a respective link to each gateway system port for each device for which the user has access rights.”.

Further, claim 39 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The computer program product [This claim is the embodied software claim for the method claim 11 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 11 rejection] according to Claim 35 wherein the computer readable program code that serves a Web page to the client comprises: computer readable program code that scans a range of private network addresses to identify Web servers listening on one or more selected ports; computer readable program code that maps each identified Web server to a respective port of a gateway on the private network; and computer readable program code that creates a Web page that contains a respective link to each gateway port for each device for which the user has access rights.”.

14. As per claim 12; “A method of accessing devices on a private network via a client on a public network, wherein each device includes a Web server having an address that is valid on the private network, but is not valid on the public network, the method comprising the following steps performed by a gateway on the private network:

accepting a user log-in request from the client prior to ascertaining rights of the user,

wherein the user log-in request includes an identification of the user, and  
wherein the user log-in request has a predetermined life span [i.e., col. 2, lines 39-  
col. 3, line 23, col. 3, lines 53-col. 5, lines 28, whereas '... the identifying of the  
client/server/particular application and/or the particular *session* ...' such that session  
aspects (i.e., the specifications thereof and associated setup/timeout, etc.), clearly  
encompasses the '...user log-in request ... ascertaining rights of the user ... user log-in  
request has a predetermined life span ...' elements of the claim language, insofar as the  
session components of the '...protocol extraction ...' aspects relate to timing (i.e.,  
predetermined) aspects of authorization and authentication, as broadly interpreted by the  
examiner.];  
ascertaining rights of a user to access one or more devices or the private network;  
serving a Web page to the client that identifies each device on the private network for  
which the user has access rights,  
wherein the Web page includes a link to a Web server of each device on the  
private network for which the user has access rights,  
wherein each link to a Web server includes a uniform resource locator (URL) for  
the gateway that is valid on the public network and an identification of a gateway port  
that is mapped to a respective Web server, and  
wherein each link is configured to send a request to a respective Web server via  
the gateway at an identified gateway port;  
receiving a request from the client to access a Web server of a device on the private  
network in response to user activation of a link on the Web page;

Art Unit: 2136

redirecting the received client request to the Web server;  
scrubbing a Web page served by the Web server in response to the received client request, comprising:

removing links to Web servers of devices for which the user does not have access rights; and

replacing an address in the Web page that is not valid on the public network with an address that is valid on the public network; and serving the scrubbed Web page to the client [This claim is the combination of claims 1,2,4 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claims 1,2,4 rejection].”.

Further, as per claim 26; “A gateway system [This claim is the system mean plus function claim for the method claim 12 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 12 rejection] that permits access to devices on a private network via a client on a public network, wherein each device includes a Web server having an address that is valid on the private network, but is not valid on the public network, wherein the gateway system comprises: means for accepting a user log-in request from the client prior to ascertaining rights of the user, wherein the user log-in request includes an identification of the user, and wherein the user log-in request has a predetermined life span; means for ascertaining rights of a user to access one or more devices on the private network; means for serving a Web page to the client that identifies each device on the private network for which the user has access rights, wherein the Web page includes a link to a Web server of each device on the private network for which the user has access rights, wherein each link to a Web server includes a uniform resource locator (URL) for

the gateway system that is valid on the public network and an identification of a gateway system port that is mapped to a respective Web server, and wherein each link is configured to send a request to a respective Web server via the gateway system at an identified gateway system port; means for receiving a request from the client to access a Web server of a device on the private network in response to user activation of a link on the Web page; means for redirecting the received client request to the Web server; and means for scrubbing a Web page served by the Web server in response to the received client request, comprising: means for removing links to Web servers of devices for which the user does not have access rights; means for replacing an address in the Web space that is not valid on the public network with an address that is valid on the public network; and means for serving the scrubbed Web page to the client. ”.

Further, as per claim 40; “A computer program product [This claim is the embodied software claim for the method claim 12 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 12 rejection] that permits access to devices on a private network via a client on a public network, wherein each device includes a Web server having an address that is valid on the private network, but is not valid on the public network, the computer program product comprising a computer usable storage medium having computer readable program code embodied in the medium, the computer readable program code comprising: computer readable program code that accepts a user log-in request from the client, wherein the user log-in request comprises an identification of the user, and wherein the user log-in request has a predetermined life span; computer readable program code that ascertains rights of a user to access one or more devices on the private network; computer readable program code that serves a Web page to the

Art Unit: 2136

client that identifies each device on the private network for which the user has access rights, wherein the Web page includes a link to a Web server of each device on the private network for which the user has access rights, wherein each link to a Web server includes a uniform resource locator (URL) for a gateway on the private network that is valid on the public network and an identification of a gateway port that is mapped to a respective Web server, and wherein each link is configured to send a request to a respective Web server via the gateway system at an identified gateway port; computer readable program code that receives a request from the client to access a Web server of a device on the private network in response to user activation of a link on the Web page; computer readable program code that redirects to received client request to the Web server; computer readable program code that scrubs a Web page served by the Web server in response to the received client request, comprising: computer readable program code that removes links to Web servers of devices for which the user does not have access rights; and computer readable program code that replaces an address in the Web page that is not valid on the public network with an address that is valid on the public network; and computer readable program code that serves the scrubbed Web page to the client. ”.

15. Claim 14 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method according to Claim 12, wherein the step of serving a Web page to the client comprises:

scanning a range of private network addresses to identify Web servers listening on one or more selected ports;

mapping each identified Web server to a respective gateway port; and



creating a Web page that contains a respective link to each gateway port for each device for which the to user has access rights.”.

The teachings of Raanan et al suggest such limitations (col. 1,lines 30-col. 10,line 18, whereas the use of a firewall/gateway to determine authorized and allowable actions by the client (i.e., col. 2,lines 39-col. 3,line 23, col. 4,lines 65-col. 5,line 29,61-67, col. 7,lines 19-25), are broadly interpreted to encompass the “mapping ... to a respective gateway port; ... creating a Web page ... link to each gateway port ... device for which the to user has access rights” limitation, and the extraction/robot module translation of addressing (i.e., URL, IP level addressing) protocol information (i.e., col. 3,lines 53-col. 4,line 33, col. 5,lines 60-col. 6,line 59, col. 7,lines 5-8, col. 8,lines 64-col. 9,line18) are broadly interpreted to encompass the “scanning a range of private network addresses to identify Web servers listening on one or more selected ports” limitation.).

Further, claim 28 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The gateway system [This claim is the system mean plus function claim for the method claim 14 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 14 rejection] according to Claim 26, wherein the means for serving a Web page to the client comprises: means for scanning a range of private network addresses to identify Web servers listening on one or more selected ports; means for mapping each identified Web server to a respective gateway system port; and means for creating a Web page that contains a respective link to each gateway system port for each device for which the user has access rights.”.

Further, claim 42 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The computer program product [This claim is the embodied software claim for the method claim 14 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 14 rejection] according to Claim 40, wherein the computer readable program code that serves a Web page to the client comprises: computer readable program code that scans a range of private network addresses to identify Web servers listening on one or more selected ports; computer readable program code that maps each identified Web server to a respective gateway port; and computer readable program code that creates a Web page that contains a respective link to each gateway port for each device for which the user has access rights.”.

#### *Response to Amendment*

16. As per applicant's argument concerning the lack of teaching by Raanan et al of “... user log-in request has a predetermined life span ...”, the examiner has fully considered in this response to amendment; the arguments, and finds them not to be persuasive. The Raanan et al teaching of a session orientation of the protocol extraction module is recited, at the very least in the context of a limiting of the “life span” of the said protocol element(s); itself clearly time restricted authorization/authentication per se. Nowhere in the claim language does the recitation of a requirement for an explicit claiming of the “predetermined life span” aspect appear; just “predetermined life span” per se. Therefore, the Raanan et al session oriented time restricting aspects, as being *broadly interpreted by the examiner*, as per the claim language, would therefore be applicable in the rejection, such that the rejection support references collectively encompass the said claim limitations in their entirety.

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2136

***Conclusion***


18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from examiner should be directed to Ronald Baum, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3861, and whose unofficial Fax number is (571) 273-3861. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh, can be reached at (571) 272-3795. The Fax number for the organization where this application is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Ronald Baum

Patent Examiner



  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100